REMARKS

ON THE

ACADEMIC.

—Mihi videmini facere idem quod ſeditioſi Cives ſolent, dum aliquos ex antiquis claros viros proferunt, quos dicant fuiſſe populares, ut eorum ipſi ſimiles eſſe videantur.

—Sed neque Saturninus *(ut noſtrum Inimicum potiſſimum nominem) ſimile quidquam habuit veterum illorum, neque Arceſilæ Calumnia conferenda eſt cum Democriti verecundiâ.*

TUL. ACAD.

LONDON:

Printed for T. TRYE, near *Gray*'s *Inn-Gate, Holborn.*

M.DCC.LI.

(Price Sixpence)

Advertiſement.

THE Publication of the following Remarks has been retarded by an Accident, which the Author begs Leave to aſſure the Publick, could neither be foreſeen nor prevented.

REMARKS
ON THE
ACADEMIC.

Cambridge, December 16. 1750.

IT is, I think, about two Months ſince we were given to expect the ſpeedy Publication of a Pamphlet, called *The Academic, or a Diſputation on the preſent State of the Univerſity of* Cambridge, *and the Propriety of the Regulations made in it, on the Eleventh Day of* May, *and the Twenty-ſixth Day of* June, 1750. I muſt own that I was much pleaſed with the Deſign; it was what I had often wiſhed to ſee well executed; and the well-choſen Sentiment of *Tully*, placed under the Title, beſpoke at once my good Opinion of the Author's Skill, and of his Integrity. Upon its appearing therefore here, I was induſtrious to procure it; and tho', after well peruſing it, I have not

much Reaſon to alter the good Opinion which I had conceived of the Author's Skill, yet from the *ridiculous Gloſs* which is thrown on one Side of the Argument, and the *diſingenuous Sophiſtry* with which the other Side is defended, I am inclined vehemently to ſuſpect his Integrity. I ſhall therefore make no other Apology for taking this publick Notice of it, than by declaring, that the Writer of the following Remarks was one of the *Reformers*; and tho' by no means a Principal in the Affair, yet too much intereſted, not to be very ſolicitous about the Iſſue of it.

It may be expected, that before I proceed, I ſhould make ſome Apology for having preſumed to aſcribe that to one Perſon, which the Critics here have adjudged to be the joint Performance of many. Perhaps I may have my Reaſons for ſo doing; but as it would be at preſent very imprudent in me to endeavour to unſettle any Opinion which they have eſtabliſhed, I ſhall only ſay in my Excuſe, that whatever may have been the Number of Contributors to this Work, the ſeveral Members of it are ſo well proportioned and adapted to each other, that I can't help applying to it what was ſaid of the famous *Pythian Statue*, δοκεῖ τὸ πᾶν ὑφ' ἑνὸς σῶμα καλασκευάδς.

We

We are conducted to the Work itſelf, thro' a formal Introduction of nine Pages, chiefly calculated for thoſe Readers, who in Mr. *Boyle*'s Phraſe, *veulent à toute force, qu'il y ait aux premieres Pages d'un Livre quelque Eſpece d' Introduction.* To their Conſideration therefore I leave it.

In the tenth Page the *Academic* makes his Appearance, and begins the Diſputation in theſe Words: " *The Gentlemen on the* " *Side of the Regulations repreſent the pre-* " *ſent Learning and Diſcipline of the Uni-* " *verſity in the moſt melancholic and dejected* " *Condition, while Extravagance and Im-* " *morality are drawn in triumphant Atti-* " *tudes, caſily baffling the united Efforts of* " *their Authority to ſuppreſs them.*" Very pictureſque! but unfortunately the Artiſt, to make the Groupe uniform, has introduced one of the principal Figures *à tort et mal à propos.* If the Reformers had repreſented the *Learning* of the Univerſity in ſo low and pitiable a Condition, we might expect to find them, in the Regulations, preſcribing to her Diſorder, and intent upon reſtoring *Her*, as well as Diſcipline, to her former Health and Vigour. To the Regulations therefore we appeal, which, without any reſpect to *Learning*, are ſolely calculated to reſtore Diſcipline, and to baniſh

Licentiouſneſs and Extravagance, which can have no Place here but to our utter Ruin. Nay, we challenge the Oppoſers to point out one Inſtance, in which the preſent State of *Learning* among us has been miſrepreſented, or even ſo much as called in Queſtion, by the Reformers. So that I think, with a little of the Academic's Skill in the Doctrine of *Motives and Conſequences*, I could eaſily make it appear, that his whole Information has been from the Oppoſers, ſince he does not know even the Principles upon which the other Party proceeded. But I have read Mr. *Brooke*'s * Preface, and am ſo charmed with that *graceful Moderation* in which he appears, that I could not preſs my Adverſary with this Advantage, without doing the utmoſt Violence to my own humane Diſpoſition.

As often as I have endeavoured to account for this groſs Miſtake in ſo eſſential a Point, the following Maxim of *Quintilian* has occurred to me. *Nemo ſic decipitur, ut de inimico ſuo mentiatur.* Perhaps therefore we may entertain a falſe Opinion of the Academic's Knowledge of this Affair, in ſuppoſing that his Miſtake was owing to Want of better Information; eſpecially if we conſider the fair Opportunity which it gave him

* See Mr. *Brooke*'s Preface to his Examination of Dr. *Middleton*'s Free Enquiry, *&c.*

him of introducing that declamatory Eulogium on the preſent State of Learning in the Univerſity. How this tended to his general Deſign, we ſhall ſee by-and-by.

The Queſtion concerning the State of the Univerſity now recurs, I think, to this; *viz.* Whether the Diſcipline of the Univerſity at that time wanted any Reformation? This is a Point, which I ſhall not diſpute. If the Academic has ſatisfied the World in this Particular, I think it my Duty not to contradict him. I would much rather lie under the Imputation of having acted injudiciouſly in voting for the Regulations, than vindicate my Behaviour at the Expence of the Honour and Reputation of the Univerſity. *Ne unquam calamus chartam mihi tangat his conviciis inarandam.* But it is high time to acquaint my Reader with my Deſign in writing theſe Papers, leſt he expect more of me than I intend to perform.

The Academic has repreſented the whole Party of the Reformers quite deſtitute of Honeſty, as well as Genius. My Deſign therefore is to defend myſelf againſt the former Part of this Charge, together with as many as gave their Voices for the Regulations upon the ſame Principle with myſelf; *i.e.* on account of the Neceſſity of

ſome

ſome Regulations in the Univerſity, and the Propriety of thoſe offered to us by our Chancellor. In doing this, I ſhall not take upon me to vindicate the Proceedings of the Heads of Colleges upon this Occaſion, or to wipe off thoſe Aſperſions, which the Academic has dealt to them ſo liberally. I am not commiſſioned to anſwer for them, and I think, that it would be but ill employing my own Time, and doing them no Service, ſeriouſly to reply to ſo much Abuſe and Falſhood.

Ὑπὲρ γὰρ οὐχὶ τῶν ἀπωλέρω φίλων,
Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς αὐτῷ τοῦτ' ἀπροσχεδῶ μύσῳ.

Let us *ſuppoſe*, with the Academic, that ſome Regulations were wanted; the remaining Queſtion is, Whether the Laws in Queſtion are well calculated to correct the Evils complained of? The Academic has brought ſeveral * good Reaſons, both preſumptive and direct, to prove that they are; to which he anſwers with a great deal of Abuſe, and no Argument.

" *The Manner*, ſays he, *of conducting the*
" *Regulations was very exceptionable, as the*
" *Sentiments of Tutors and Deans of Col-*
" *leges were not conſulted, till after the*
" *Laws were made, reviſed by the Chan-*
" *cellor,*

* Pag. 29, 30.

" *cellor, and ſent down to the publick Body*
" *of the Senate*; till they found themſelves
" under the *diſagreeable Neceſſity of voting*
" *for what they could not approve, or of diſ-*
" *obliging the Chancellor*," whom the Academic never fails to mention with great Reſpect.

Καὶ ΣΟΙ τ᾽ ΘΗΣΕΩΣ ὄνομα ϑωπεῦσαι καλόν.

" *And this, notwithſtanding they ſaw*
" *themſelves provoked by the moſt injurious*
" *Treatment.*" Who ſaw themſelves provoked? Not the Tutors and Deans of Colleges, but the Oppoſers. By the injurious Treatment of whom? Not of the Oppoſers, but the Tutors and Deans of Colleges. There may, perhaps, be a Connexion between theſe Propoſitions; but it requires at leaſt the Perſpicuity of an *Academic* to diſcover it.

But to what Purpoſe would it have been to conſult thoſe about Reformation, who tell us that there was no Occaſion for it, and who conſidered any publick Attempt to reſtore the Diſcipline and Character of the Univerſity, as an injurious Reflection upon themſelves, and any Complaint, how general ſoever, as a *ſcandalous Miſrepreſentation* of their own boaſted Labours and Succeſs? We might, I muſt own, have been

been otherwiſe at a Loſs to diſcover the Reaſon of ſuch a profound Secrecy in the Making and Preparation of theſe Regulations; but the Oppoſers themſelves furniſh us with a very good Reaſon for it, a Reaſon which will ſufficiently vindicate the Vice-Chancellor and Heads with every candid and impartial Judge.

But we are told, that "* *The Reſentments of the Oppoſers, when the moſt inflamed, were ever directed towards their proper Objects; that they always approved of the Chancellor's Conduct in the Affair; and it was not the leaſt of their Mortifications, that they were* not allowed "to expreſs them in the general and publick Manner, in *which they deſired.*" The latter Part of this Period I do moſt firmly believe to be true. *It was none of the leaſt of* their Mortifications, that the Grace which is hinted at in this Paragraph, and was preſented to the Senate by that *honourable Demagogue*, ſhould be rejected; that this *Corps de Reſerve* ſhould be ſo ſuddenly and unexpectedly cut off; and that, when the Oppoſers could no longer bite, they were not allowed the Liberty of even ſhewing their Teeth. The Grace was ſtopped in the Caput by an allowed Judge of Propriety, and tho' *a ſtaunch Friend to the Orders*, yet by

* Pag. 32.

by no means to be ſuſpected of Prejedice in Favour of the Heads, or againſt the Perſon who preſented it; and who, I am well aſſured, ſtopped it for no other Reaſon than as it contained a very ill-timed Sneer upon the whole Proceedings.

The * two next Paragraphs do not fall under my Conſideration, as they contain nothing more than an ingenious Problem, in which it is moſt clearly made out, that a Head of a College muſt neceſſarily be an Old Woman.

—ἔργον γενναῖον καὶ φιλόδημον!

I ſhall therefore proceed to ſpeak to the Regulations themſelves, ſuch of them, I mean, as the Academic has taken under particular Conſideration.

And here I can't help obſerving, that, contrary to the uſual *Candour* and *Politeneſs* of the Academic, the Reformers are not ſuffered to ſpeak in Defence of each Regulation; but are obliged to leave them naked and unarmed to the Rage and Fury of the mercileſs Oppoſers. But, upon Enquiry into the Cauſe of this Partiality, I very readily excuſed it, and contented myſelf, with ſeeing upon this Occaſion only one of the

* Page 33, 34.

Academic's Faces. The Truth is his *Legerdemain* failed him here, and he found, that even to mention the Fitneſs and Expediency of each Regulation, would be to juſtify them beyond Exception, and entirely preclude all that Rhetoric and Wit, with which he has here ſo plentifully furniſhed the Oppoſers.

The Regulation, firſt to be conſidered, is that which prohibits the wearing Lace in the Univerſity. It would be ridiculous to prove formally the Expediency of this Regulation. If any thing can be ſaid againſt it, we ſhall find it in the Academic, who has *ranſack'd every imaginable Topic of Argument on both Sides.* Let us then conſider what he has ſaid upon it.

" * *To entirely prohibit Lace in the Uni-*
" *verſity, may be expedient, if it be reaſonable*
" *to debar ſome of its Members from Ex-*
" *pences, which their Fortunes will admit*
" *of, leſt others, by their Example, ſhould be*
" *tempted to Extravagancies.*" Thus ſay the Oppoſers. But the Reformers carry the Matter much farther. They maintain, that to prohibit Lace would be very expedient, if the Fortunes of *every* Member of the Univerſity would admit of the Expence, and rhat for a Reaſon too obvious, I think, to be mentioned.

* Page 35.

mentioned. " *But how ſhall we reconcile it* " *to common Senſe, that they who are pro-* " *hibited from wearing Lace upon one Part* " *of their Dreſs, ſhould be compell'd to wear* " *it upon another! And why of all others* " *muſt it be their Academical Habit?*" A Perſon unacquainted with the Univerſity, would from this and the remaining Part of this Paragraph, conclude that the Reformers had made a ſort of Commutation with the Fellow-Commoners, and had removed the Lace from their Coats and Waiſtcoats, only to emblazon and enrich their Gowns. It will be neceſſary therefore to ſet this Matter right.

The Words of the Regulation, as far as it concerns thePoint in Queſtion, are as follow.

" *Every Fellow-Commoner ſhall provide* " *himſelf with his proper Gown.*"

Now it happens either by the *particular Statutes*, or the *particular Policy* of one *College*, that the proper Habits of their Fellow-Commoners are moſt gorgeouſly adorned with Lace. They have indeed, ſince the paſſing of the Regulations, ſeen the Impropriety of theſe Gowns; and now oblige the Fellow-Commoners to wear others leſs expenſive, and much more ſuitable to that grave Deportment, which is in fact more

ornamental to a Student, than any the moſt coſtly Embelliſhments of Dreſs. But this the Academic makes uſe of to accuſe the Reformers of compelling the Fellow-Commoners *in general* to wear Lace, whereas the Cenſure ought to have fallen only upon that College, which could ſo long retain ſo ridiculous a Habit, under the Pretext of its being what they called *ſtatutable* or *proper*.

The other Regulation, which the Academic has taken into Conſideration, is that which forbids *riding* to all under the Degree of *A. M.* or other Degrees of the ſame Rank. It is aſſerted, " *That this Regulation* " *wants ſome Degree of Latitude, the Con-* " *ſequences of it being likely upon all Suppo-* " *ſitions to be very pernicious : For if it be* " *not obſerved, the Contempt it will bring* " *upon all Authority, will certainly be pre-* " *judicial to the Diſcipline of the Univer-* " *ſity.*" If by this be meant, that a Non-obſervance of the *due Execution* of this Law will bring Contempt upon the Authority which impoſed it, to this we readily agree ; but, while Power continues in ſo good Hands, as we at preſent ſee it, there is no Reaſon to fear this ; and it muſt be by a moſt extraordinary Kind of Operation, that the Non-obſervance of the Law itſelf, or any Law ſupported by proper Sanctions, can reflect any Diſgrace or Contempt upon the Le-

Legiſlator. And as to the *Improbability of the Suppoſition*, that Men of three or four-and-twenty Years of Age ſhould *ſubmit* to aſk Leave of their Tutor to ride out, the Academic muſt excuſe me, if I do not take his Word for it, when daily Experience convinces me to the contrary. But 'tis ſaid, "*That the greater Part of Undergra-*"*duates are already too ſedentary, and there-*"*fore the Students*, (in general) *ſhould be ra-*"*ther encouraged to uſe more Exerciſe, than*"*diſcouraged from uſing ſo much.*" This Conſequence is ſomewhat haſty. But ſuppoſing it to be true, yet does it by no means impeach the Uſefulneſs of a Law, which has not the leaſt Tendency to reſtrain the proper Uſe of Exerciſe, the Tutor having it in his own Power to give as frequent, or as general, a Permiſſion as he thinks proper.

The Academic's next and laſt Complaint againſt the Regulations themſelves, is againſt thoſe enacted for the Suppreſſion "*of Riots*,"*Gaming, and Vices of a ſtill groſſer Kind*,"*the Publication of Laws of this Kind in*"*an Univerſity, without taking Notice of*"*thoſe already in being, implying either, that*"*there are no ſuch Laws, or that Vice pleads*"*Impunity by Preſcription.*" It muſt be confeſt, that the Publication of a Law already in full Force is a Soleciſm in Government; but I cannot ſee why the mere Change of Laws in the Univerſity ſhould bring

bring Scandal upon its Governors, when it is confeſt, that in all other Governments ſuch Changes are very frequent, and very neceſſary. The Academic therefore, if he would prove any thing, ſhould bring the *Statutes* againſt thoſe particular Vices, and the *Regulations* themſelves, Face to Face. We then might have compared them together, and judged of the Propriety of his Complaint.

But as this is a Matter which rather concerns thoſe who made the Regulations, than thoſe who only aſſented to them, I ſhall purſue the Conſideration of it no farther; for, ſuppoſing the Academic's Complaint to be ever ſo well grounded, I think it a ſufficient Vindication of thoſe, who only gave their Voices for *theſe* Regulatiens, that the Conſequences of their having been rejected muſt have been much worſe, than any that can ariſe from their being received, which, at the worſt, is nothing more than an Offence againſt a mere ſpeculative Point of Government.

And now, having anſwered thoſe Parts of the Academic's Diſputation, which were intended to reflect Diſgrace upon ſuch Members of the Senate as gave their Voices for the Regulations, I ſhall endeavour to ſet forth,

forth, in as few Words as poſſible, the Deſign of this extraordinary Performance.

The Deſign may be conſidered as Two-fold: *Firſt*, With regard to the *Reformers*, and, *Secondly*, With regard to the *Academic* himſelf.

Firſt, With regard to the REFORMERS. His Deſign was to render them as odious as poſſible to the World, which he endeavours, by attempting to prove theſe two Points. *Firſt*, That there were no Regulations wanting; and, *Secondly*, That, if there were, thoſe in queſtion are by no means calculated to produce the End deſigned. The firſt of theſe Points we do not diſpute with Him; but rely upon the Judgment of the World for our Vindication. And the ſecond he does not diſpute with us. For, as I before obſerved, he has not ſuffered us to ſpeak to it; but "*has dreſs'd up ſuch Opinions as* "*it has pleaſed him; and when he has with* "*a great deal of Pomp attacked and con-* "*founded theſe Images of Straw of his own* "*making, he triumphs over us, as tho' he* "*had confuted our Opinions;*" and expoſed not only our Want of common Senſe, but even our Eſtrangement to common Honeſty.

This

This ſeems to have been his Deſign, with regard to the *Reformers*: Let us now conſider it with regard to *Himſelf*.

This I cannot illuſtrate ſo well, as by reminding my Reader of the Character of *Chremylus* in the Comedy. *Chremylus* complains, that the Favours of *Plutus*, the blind God of Riches, are conferred on very improper and very undeſerving Perſons, and therefore reſolves to reſtore him to Sight. Wealth, he thought, would then be confined to Merit; and, in an *equitable* Diſtribution of Things, it would be impoſſible, that *Chremylus* ſhould go away unrewarded. I ſhall here compliment my Reader's Underſtanding ſo far, as to omit the Application, which I cannot draw at Length without exceeding my Sixpeny Limitation.

But I cannot conclude, without congratulating the Univerſity upon the great good Effects which the Regulations have already produced. To mention Particulars I have not room; but, in general, I can ſay with great Truth, and with great Pleaſure, that the Appearance of the Univerſity is already very much improved by them; and that we have not the leaſt Doubt, but that a conſtant and vigorous Execution of them will every

every way anſwer the End deſigned, by reſtoring the Univerſity to ſuch a Degree of Excellency, as may ſtop the Noiſe and Clamour of our Enemies; increaſe the Number, and merit the Protection, of our Friends, eſpecially of that *great Man*, who to this ſole End has taken upon Himſelf the Name and Office of our Chancellor.